ARNOLD & PORTER



July 2, 2002

David R. Marsh, Ph.D. David_Marsh@aporter.com

202.942.5068 202.942.5999 Fax

555 Twelfth Street, NW Washington, DC 20004-1206

RECEIVED

JUL 0 8 2002

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

Re:

U.S. Patent Application No. 09/692,257

Filed: October 19, 2000

Title: Nucleic Acid Molecules and Other Molecules Associated with Plants

Inventors: Philip W. MILLER *et al.*Our Ref. No.: 16517.001/38-21(15771)B

Sir:

Transmitted herewith are the following documents for appropriate action by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office:

- 1. Response to Restriction Requirement; and
- 2. Return postcard.

Please stamp the attached postcard with the filing date of these documents and return it to our courier.

Applicants do not believe that any fees are due in conjunction with this filing. If, however, any fees are required, including any extension of time fees necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions are hereby petitioned. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee deficiency and/or credit any overpayment to our Deposit Account No. 50-1824, referencing matter number 16517.001/38-21(15771)B.

Respectfully submitted,

David R. Marsh (Reg. No. 41,408)

June E. Cohan (Reg. No. 43,741)

Holly Logue Prutz (Reg. No. 47,755)

Attachments

Washington, DC

New York

Los Angeles

Century City

Denver

London

Northern Virginia

THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:

Philip W. MILLER et al.

Appl. No.: 09/692,257

Filed: October 19, 2000

Title: Nucleic Acid Molecules and Other

Molecules Associated with Plants

Art Unit: 1637

Examiner: Shar S. HASHEMI

Atty. Docket: 16517.001/38-21(15771)B

RECEIVED

Response to Restriction Requirement

JUL 0 8 2002

Commissioner for Patents Washington, D.C. 20231

TECH CENTER 1600/2900

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed June 3, 2002 (Paper No. 6), Applicants submit the following amendments and remarks.

REMARKS

The application presently contains claims 1-7. In the Office Action mailed June 3, 2002 (Paper No. 6), the Examiner required restriction to one of the following inventions under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

Group I: Claim 1, is drawn to a nucleic acid molecule that encodes a maize protein or fragment thereof, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.

Group II: Claim 2, is drawn to a maize protein, classified in class 530, subclass 300.

Group III: Claims 3–7, are drawn to a transformed plant, classified in class 800, subclass 295.